P.F. 2 of 96.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1273-94.

~~192~~ —.

(Famine Relief)

File No. 7 7 & 93

Serial Nos. 1 to 14.

Later references.

L

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos 1 to 14.

~~Part~~ B for January 1894.

SUBJECT.

VD 2250—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

(14)

The Queen

In 1894 Hirananchiar of Jaffna applied for registration of Iranilam land No 76 granted by Government His petition was sent to the Deputy Commissioner - A report was received & trial orders were received by Government directing interference with a registration that took place long ago - This was in 1894 - An advertisement was accordingly given of the Petitioner

In 1895 the Petitioner urged a reconsideration of the case on the grounds that the land remained in his khaki till 1888 & that there is no evidence to show it returned to him to that year - The 2nd after reciting that "it seems she is hardly" Commissioner ordered that the report with the original papers

Thursday was fixed by Mr Thompson for the Petitioner & Advocate

must be called for - Also the
Railroad papers if any
relating to the transfer of the
land to the present occupant
(Kamlekanda) as well as
an extract from the Patna
register whether the
land has been under cultivation
since the grant - (Kamlekanda)
The deputy Commissioner
was further asked to report
whether the land in question
the petitioner stated till 1888
why petitioner should not
take an equivalent of the
land elsewhere -

In sending the records
called for, the deputy Commissioner
reports that the land in question
was in the khata of the
the petitioner since 1888 which year
~~before~~ it was assumed by
Government, that it formed

The Dy Comr reports in reply that Petr desires that Sacs 17 gunthas out of his Kandayam Inm S No 157 in Settikali village may be granted as Inam in lieu of the relinquished Inam

As regard the 2nd point, the Dy Comr states the admitted fact that when in 1880-81 30 gunthas of the relinquished Inam was taken up for Railway purposes, no compensation was given to Petr and that Petr had not preferred any claim 2 his

Ltr dated 6/7/97

Under all the circs of the case the Petr deserves well treated with generosity. His case as Inamdar in the settlement of 11 Fts was improved upon subsequently when this Khalsat was not collected — a

at a later stage the
~~Station~~ settlement
map was revised
more liberally &
the Khalsat addition was reduced
by more than a half -
Gurdeep Singh's
share, it may be
said was not forfeited
till 1889 - In the
meantime the land
had passed to others'
hands - There is a
note in the register
that the Govt relinquished
the land & the original
document is missing
He now ~~declares~~ explains that
he did not tender a
resignation & keeps
that a bahan of this
kind is in the village
of Sathalli may be
granted as much in
lieu of what he has
lost - The extent of this
land in survey No 157
is 3 acres & 20 guntas
and is assessed at 2 7-8-0
The revised settlement
confers upon him an
area of 26-8-0 - The
difference one rupee

Government Waste since 1882-83
till 1888 when it was made
over to the present occupant &
that the petitioner is not entitled
to any exchange of land
since he did not surrendered
the Inam land in 1881 but
that as a matter of grace
an equivalent in area to
that of the Inam confirmed
by the Inam Department viz
seven parcels
3-19 assessed at Rs. 26-8-
may be granted -

The Darkhast papers
received with the Deputy
Commissioner's report of the
20th July 1896 show that a
Darkhast was received
for Survey No. 76 from
Kumbra in 1888 & made
over to him in the same year
According to the Amildar's

The Darkhast was forwarded
on 7-[illegible]-88 & on the same
day Amildar sent an order
to Sirsidar to grant the land
to Darkhastdar if the allegations
in the Statement submitted by Shanbhog
viz that there were no trees
on the land, and that it was
fit waste, since Vishnu were
true also if Kambiahs own
the 1/3rd Darkhast - possession
was given to Kambia on 27.11.88

Report of 13-2-94 the Land
Confirmed the Inam till
Vishu when it was resumed.
by Government - Previously
the land was in the Khata
of petitioner's father Thammanna
his brother Kesavalher.
The land has been under
Cultivation since 1888.
The Amildar states that
there is a Record note in the
Register kept for the purpose
that the resumption was
made after issue of notice
to the Inamdar but the Consent
but that the records connected
therewith are not forthcoming

Ans.

29/7/96 The Dy Comr was asked to
report whether there was any
land eligible to be given in exchange
for the relinquished Inam & to call
on petr to prove his statement that
the patta continued in his name
till 1888.

Sub^d to Secretary

The draft order – passed on review – reverses an order passed by the Commissioner (Mess^rs Thumboo Chettiyar & Chentsalnad) (serial nos 4 & 5 of the Pleadings file)

The case is also one which would ordinarily be classed as a Criminal case (claim to land free of payment of Kandayan) –

orders should be as to

Whether the draft should also be sent to the Commissioner

20/7/97

I am not sure that this is a complicated case & whether it does not call for special consideration

(vide 5 (no 13)

In his appeal petition the petitioners asked
either for the restoration of his Mauri land
or for the grant of other land in lieu thereof.
In the order of Government there was nothing
said specially about the second prayer.
The rejection of the appeal may however
be taken to mean that both the prayers were refused.
I am therefore of opinion that this matter
should now go before both the 1st & 2nd Councillors.
Please send this note to 2nd Councillor.

Initialled: C.S.
24.7.99.

Endorsed 2nd Councillor
(Intd) V.B.D.
27-7-99.

Certainly, submit to 1st Councillor or
more appropriately to the Premier. He is the
referee in all cases of doubt & difficulty

Initialled) P.N.K.
22-7-99

Certainly to the Premier, as it is now proposed
to reopen question, the Government declined
to entertain the resumption of lease
twelve years ago.

22-7-99 Initialled) J.R.M.

10

may be treated as a Pet^n and the Rules thereof sanctioned

14.7.97 [illegible]

draft proceedings to-day

[illegible] 14/7/97

As a matter of grace the sum may be restored & allocated as proposed

14.12.97

[illegible]

909

× an order may issue accordingly

17-12-97

[illegible] 17/12/97

The 2nd Comalla headnoted that before issue of orders, the same may be placed before the Court for approval.

26/7/97

Issue Writ orders accordingly

[illegible] 21/12/97

[illegible] Seems [illegible] had been [illegible] into other [illegible] all [illegible] entered & Pet^n's defeated [illegible] sum as a matter of grace restored [illegible] sum to sue, but we must not [illegible] the exchange [illegible] and sought for. Pet^n may be receiving [illegible] and dear, & may be [illegible] tenant [illegible] employés under him & pays the [illegible] for assessment

The draft requires slight alteration as to remarks

[illegible] 22/12/97

As a matter of fact the Dean may be
invited & allowed as proposed

(Initialled) K.S
14.12.97.

Submitted to the Offg Dean & 1st
Commission. Initialled. C.S.
17.12.97.

Ordered may issue accordingly
Initialled. D.R.N.T.
17.12.97.

Submit to 1st Commission
Initialled. C.S. 20.12.97.

Seen. Issue Order accordingly
Initialled - P.R.K.
21-12-97.

In the draft - Some slight alteration has
to be made.

Bring up.
Initialled. D.R.N.

I have modified the Draft. 22.12.97.
Before issue, let me see
the Endorsement to Petitioner
Initialled - D.R.N.
4/1/98.

10.6

The Second Councillor has directed that before issue of the orders the same may be placed before the Dewan for approval.

Initialed) V.P.D.

26/7/97.

(General Serial No. 32.)

189

No. 23/8

Name of Petitioner. Venkata Krishna Rao & Mallikarjuna Rao

Village.

Taluk. Nellore

District.

Date of Arzi. 9/6/94

Date of Receipt. 11/6/94

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Three

ABSTRACT.

Petn. begs to state that the allegation that the Amildar admits that there is no proof that Anybody else has enjoyed possession of his Inam lands

V.J. 21/8/94

Submitted to Council

Sd/- Illegible
Asst. Secretary

The Petrs allegation that the Amildar admits that there is no proof of anybody else having enjoyed possession of his Inam lands is not correct.

V.J. 11/8

Sd/- Illegible
Asst. Secretary

11/8/94.

Petr's attached Memo

11

(2)

(12)

to you. You ask that
it be restored to you
Lands in the possession
of others Cannot be
forcibly taken from
them and restored to you.
If you select other lands
and intimate to the Collector
he will write to the Officer
regarding their grant to
you as usual.

Petitioner) urges
that the order passed
~~by~~ on appeal made
in the Khalsat regarding
that the lands in question
are Inam, that the
sale is suspicious and
that there is no proof that
he gave up possession of
the land. He first had
the right to ~~G~~ Enquire and the
land for Collectorate and
to Collect Assessment.

The Pet further
says In 1888 the proper
Enquiries were made. If the
Authorities had made proper
Enquiries then there would
not have been any
occasion for another
to get possession of
the lands. Inam lands
being Inam lands cannot
lawfully be given
to Others and assess-
ment be Collected
from them by Govt.

Pet also says that
he applied to the Collec-
tor for the refund
of Assessment
Collected by Govt and
that no orders have
been passed.

Pet prays

(1) that his hereditary
Inam may be
lands may be
restored to him
~~(2)~~ or other lands of
~~the~~ same extent and
equal in Quality
may be given to him

(2) that the Assessment
levied by Govt from 1888
may be ordered to be paid
to him.

Pet √ 281

(13)

24-8-

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

(3)

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L. R. 79-93-2

The accompanying Petition No. 3578
dated 9th June 1894 received at the
Dewan's Office from Ramanachari
Srinivasa, praying for the restoration
to him of his hereditary Carnam
Inam below Magala Tank, in
Nagenahalli Amani Tumkur Taluk,
given up by the petitioner during
Inam settlement
is forwarded, together with its three
enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner
for [illegible] report
[illegible] the petitioner [illegible]
Enclosures should be returned.

By Order.

Draft.

Chief Secretary.

BANGALORE,
11th June 1894.

24.

Connected
SKR.
1718

M.G.C.P., Bangalore.—3-5-94.—1,000.

1718

(General Serial No. 30.)

1894. Pol. 248

4769

15 OCT. 94

Misc.

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

L.R. 79-93-3

(4)

To

The Chief Secretary to the Govt of Mysore.

Dated 12th September 94

Despatched 12th —do—

Received

Enclosures No. 2 as filed

General No. 334
No.

Subject

Vide official memo: No. Pol 281 of 4th August 94

Reporting on the petition of Narasaiah of Tumkur.

Read 19/10

Submitted to Council 22/10

No: 334 (151)

Encls: 2 files

Tamkan District

Deputy Commissioner's Office

Tamkan 16th October 1894

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your Official Memorandum No. Pol 281 dated the 1st August 1894 forwarding (for report with proceedings) the petition of Chandra of Tamkan (Complaining that his Inam land below the village assessment in the Barabagre Sammath of the Tamkan Taluk was assumed by Government without his consent and praying that it may be restored to him) I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The Inam land in question is wet field bearing survey No. 76 measuring A 4. 11. and assessed at Rs. 85. The Inamdar used to pay on it a Jodi

application and is to this day in his possession. Now after 12 years the Inamdar claims his Inam saying that he never resigned it, that the Government resumed it without his Consent and that he should therefore not only get back his land but also Compensation for the portion of it taken up for the railway. He seems to advance this claim as the notice served on him in 1881-82 which bore his reply that led to the resumption of his land is missing. It seems to have been mislaid carelessly and wilfully. But its absence, however, does not go very much in favor of the Inamdar as the fact of his having kept quiet for 12 years, firstly when the land was

(19)

resumed in 1881-82, secondly when a portion of it was taken up for the railway in 1885-86 and thirdly when it was given over to another in 1888-89 implies his tacit Consent to all this. He appears to have set up his claim as in the revised settlement made recently by the Survey Department as per favorable rules passed by Government in regard to the treatment of Kalsat lands, more land, (viz 3-17 A. G. assessed at 26½ Rupees) was confirm-ed as Inam than had been done before (viz: 2-34 A. G. assessed at 22 Rs). When, however, he applied here he was informed that if he chose a suitable field in lieu of his lost Inam a recommendation would be made. Upon this he has now appealed to Government.

2

patent of annas 5 for acknm.

in the Register of Leases received
from the Survey Department in the
year Fasli (1332-33) the whole of the
number was not confirmed as Exam.
but an extent of 2- 8½ specified at
Appeal in the said patent of
annas 5, and the remaining extent
of 2- 8½ specified at Appeal was
treated as Waste or area in excess of
the original grant. Upon this a
notice was issued to the Examiner
by the said Officer to say if he would
retain the entire inam and, how
the specimens on the waste land were.
In pursuance of the notice issued
by him thereon the whole Inam was
measured by Government in the same
year i.e. Fasli (1332-33) as can be seen
from the remarks made in the Register
of Patta Inams kept in the Taluk

(12)

Office. The remark to the effect that the claim was received too late was erased. That notice is not forthcoming and so it cannot be positively stated what effect the remark signified on it. It is however clear that it related to the presumption of the claim then and there i.e. 2 years ago in the year Hicks the year Parthia
(1881-82). Then in (1885-86) an Extent for 30 grants agreed at £ Rupees out of the main land was taken up for the Railway. No Confirmation thereof was paid to any body as the entire field had reverted to Government 4 years previously, and none could in consequence claim rewards. The remaining Extent of the field A Kg namely 5-2 agreed at Rupees was given in the year Samvatsare (1888-89) to one Ramchandra for his

4. 3. The Commissioners request the

subject matter with the Jamaica

Auditor's report No. 4 of 25 dated the

26th September 59 are herewith sub-

mitted as also the enclosures of

the official Memo: under reply.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient Servant

Patrick Carmichael

Deputy Commissioner

Jamaica District

Ramanathan
8-6-94
Bangalore

MYSORE DEWAN'S PETITION DEPARTMENT
RD. No. 5518
DATE 11-6-94

21

(1)

One Rupee stamp affixed & cancelled.

To

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit that I am a native of Mysore and have been living in Bangalore for the last 15 years. I am a graduate of the Madras University and have been practising as a Vakil in the Bangalore Courts for the last 10 years. I have a wife and two children to support. My income from my profession is about Rs. 200 per month. I have no other source of income. I have no property of any kind. I have no debts. I have never been convicted of any offence. I have never been arrested. I have never been in trouble with the police. I have always been a loyal subject of Your Highness. I have always paid my taxes regularly. I have always obeyed the laws of the State. I have always respected the authorities. I have always been a good citizen.

I have the honour to request that Your Highness will be pleased to grant me a free pass for myself and my family to travel on the railways of the State. I am willing to pay the usual fare for the journey. I am willing to give any security that may be required. I am willing to sign any bond that may be required. I am willing to do anything that may be required of me.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your Highness' most obedient and loyal subject,

Ramanathan

Bangalore
8-6-94

(6)

L.R.79-93-5.

3518.

Draft

24

(5)

No. 3578

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT,

15th December 189 4

L.R. 79-93-4

Endorsement granted to Narana Chary, Son of Thammanna Chary of Tumkur

in reply to his Petition Registered No. 3518 dated 9-6-94

appealing against the Order of the Deputy Commr Tumkur No 305 dated 14 March 1894 passed on his appeal No 76, rejecting his Claim to obtain certain land

Petitioner is informed that

by order of Tumkur, further enquiry in the matter, to be a Varamanya Inam belonging to him but resumed by Govt.

Petitioner is informed that his appeal has been dismissed as the Govt decline to interfere with the resumption that took place 12 years ago — & Petitioner never objected to —

Enclosures are returned

(By order)

15/12/94 No 10314 Pet: 934 9-12-94 22

Copy to the D Commr Tumkur, returning the Records received with his No 334 dated 11 October 1894.

"By Order"

15/12

for Chief Secretary.

27/10

M. G. O. P., Bangalore—6-3-94.—2000.

(8)

No. 700/P.1378 dated 3.2.96.

To Encl: 7.

The Deputy Commr.
Tumkur Distt.

L.R.79-93-7.

dated 3rd Feby/96

In forwarding herewith the accompanying Petition no. 2296 dated 20th Dec. 1895 with its 6 Enclosures presented to this office by Narayanachari of Tumkur praying for reconsideration of orders conveyed to him in this office End.t no. 3518 dated 15-12-94 regarding the resumption of Survey no. 76 below Maidala tank in the Tumkur Taluk, has the honour to request that the Deputy Commr. will be so good as to report whether or not the petitioner's allegation that the land in dispute was in his Khata till the year 1888 is true and why the petitioner should not take an Equivalent Git Elsewhere.

2 The Deputy Commr. is also requested to submit

the original papers connected with the case together with the Dunkhast papers if any relating to it grant to the present occupant, and an Extract from the Jahani to show whether the land was cultivated ever since the grant to the present occupant.

3 The petition should be returned.

By order

(Draft) H Oh 3/2/96

for Rev. Secretary

HCh 31.1.96

Cy

19

(7)

1895-96

No. 2296

Name of Petitioner, Ramanathan

Tirumalai

Village, Periang

Taluk,

District, Tanjore

Date of Arzi, 20-12-95

Date of Receipt, 7-1-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure,

ABSTRACT.

Praying for reconsideration of his appeal rejected by the office and R.O. 30-15-9 15-12-94 on the following grounds:-

1- That there are grounds for believing that S. No. 96 of Irumbalai situated under the Nannilam Taluk is still in the name of the Zamindar and is still so.

2. That in the year 1853 the Inquiry in his order No. 9 87/50 the Taluk Amildar has said that Khalsath land should not be given to any other person than the

Khalsath land

Nannilam

Irumbalai

Periang

Tanjore

Zamindar

Inquiry

Amildar

Khalsath

Collector

Clearance

26.1.96

at Kiranda and consequently he may cultivate the land under dispute and that consequently his Inam was not taken up to Govt till Jany 1858.

3. That from the Khetwar accounts from the years 1881 to 1885, it would be evident that the land under dispute was in the Pot's khata upto the year 1885, when it was given to another for cultivation.

4. That in the year 1892 the Inam Sirkar included the land under dispute in his Inam and gave him a Samud to that effect. That from ~~the copy of the Inam Register~~ a copy of the Quit-rent Register of the Inam Samud of the year 1802, it would be evident that the land was included under Inam upto the year 1892

5. That the Circle Inspector in his endorsement that proper references are not forthcoming to show that the land was taken up by Government

Bbs.

L.R-79-93-8

30

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 573
Rel No. 42
24 JUL. 96
1896
DIWAN'S OFFICE
9

Sale in Hebbi with reference to the 2nd Councillor's order on petn. of 2296-7 20.12.95

Gen. 31

AS 28/7

23/7

From Mahomed Ghouse, the land was under cultivation for Parthéva, Khasa Nandavana, Vijaya Mannatte

Send for orders. Note given

30/7

By predecessor — matter — is unfortunate — Known — if there are land eligible to give grain equivalent of what he has lost. Allow Dfr grain to be a loan in connection with the sale, and report when the whole question may be considered once more. It is also desirable that the Dfr should examine the petr and all his witnesses & ascertain his statement that the Valavay in his name till 1888. Mutt 6.8.96

From Deputy Commissioner of Bangalore District.

To Secretary to the Govt of Mysore. Col and Revenue Departments.

Dated 24th July 1896.

Despatched 24 — do —

Received

General No. 587
No.

Enclosure No. Vernfile

In letter No. 301 of the 5.8.96
5th February 1896.

Report on the petition of Channéshan of Hebbi.

Pet. Mahomed
23/7/96
Mahomed

Petition sent herewith.
23/7

Draft arranged
Draft 10/8/96

31
No: 68

Jaffna District

Land Settlement File Deputy Commissioner's Office
II

Jaffna 26th July, 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of
Ceylon, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

In returning herewith the petition received with your docket No: 7001/P1378 dated 5th February 1896, from Arunachalam of Jaffna regarding the resumption of his Inam land bearing Survey No: 76 Colon the Plan in the Jaffna Taluk, I have the honor to submit herewith the vernacular file relating thereto together with papers connected with the grant of the land for cultivation in the year 1858-59 to its present occupant Kumbegowda and an Extract from the Pahani Register from the year Parthiva 1855-56.

2. The Petitioners allegation that the land in question was in his Khate

2. that till the year 1888 is not true. Previous to its resumption by Government in 1881-82, the land had been registered in the names of Nanjeshar, Subbannachar and Sannammachar. From 1882-83 till 1888-89, it was shown as Government waste and in the later year, the name of Ramegowda was registered as the occupant.

3. As a matter of right, the petitioner is not entitled to the grant of any land in exchange for the Inam land since he deliberately resigned it in 1857, but as an act of grace, he may be granted an area equivalent to that of the Inam as confirmed by Inam Department, viz., A. 6-0, G. 17 ajeeced at Rupees 26-8-0.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Nanjunda Rao
Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur district

EV.-

13

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
1915

32

Y.R. 79-93-10 Gen. 31]

189 6 Pt 171

Rev 879/96

Received in Rev. Branch.
Transferred to Rev. Board.
9/9
14/9/96

3 of 96 in pencil.

with a draft docket returning
9/96

From The Deputy Commr.
Tinnevelly District.

To The Secretary to the
Govt of Mysore, Genl &

Dated Rev: Departments,

Despatched 7th September
Received 1896

General No. 262.
No.

Enclosure No.

Requesting that the
Vernacular records &
Connected with the &
Complaint of Ramachan
of Tinnevelly regarding
the resumption of his
Inam land No 76 below
the Nicidala Tank in
the Tinnevelly Taluk Sub-
-mitted with this office
letter No 68 of 20th July 1896
may be kindly caused
to be returned to this offic
for reference

29

No. 262 (11)

Tiptur District.

Deputy Commissioner's Office.

Tiptur 7th September 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore. General and Revenue Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to request that the vernacular records connected with the complaint of Naranappa of Tiptur regarding the resumption of his Inam land No 76 below the Mydala Tank in the Tiptur Taluk, submitted with my letter No 687 the 20th July 1896 may be kindly caused to be returned to this Office, as they are required for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt servant

Illegible
for Deputy Commissioner

36

(10) Draft for approval

L.R. 79-93-9

1896

To the Deputy Commr
Tumkur District

No 1655-
55.3-96 dated 11th August 1896

His letter no 68 dated
20th July 1896 reporting
on the petition of Narasimha
of Tumkur regarding the
resumption of the petitioner's
Inam land below the
Maidala tank in the
Tumkur Taluk and stating
that on a portion of same he erected

fixated an area equivalent
unit of the Inam as confirmed
by the Inam Department.

with reference to the
above has the honour
to request that ~~the Deputy~~
~~Commr will be pleased~~
~~as to state if there is~~
any land available to be
given to the petitioner
as an equivalent of
what he has lost, ~~and~~
may be
~~if~~ selected ~~a land~~ in
consultation with the
petitioner and, ~~transmit~~
~~submit a report in the~~
~~matter when the whole~~
a report of such
collection should

49

No. 262

Tiptur District.
Deputy Commissioner's Office.
Tiptur 7th September 1896.

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore. General and Re-
-venue Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to request that the vernacular records con-
-nected with the complaint of Naranalchar of Tiptur regard-
-ing the resumption of his Inam land No 76 below the Hygala Tank in the Tiptur Taluk, sub-
-mitted with my letter No 687 the 20th July 1896 may be kindly caused to be returned to this Office, as they are required for reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedt. Servant

Rhodhadeiengal
Ag for Deputy Commissioner

L. R. 79-93-12

41

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Gl. No. 8699
Pet. No. 744
28 JUN 97
DEWAN'S OFFICE

1897

From The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District.

To The Secretary
to the Govt of Mysore,
Genl & Revenue Depts. —

Dated 24th June 1897
Despatched 25th "
Received

General No. 1064.
No.

Enclosure No. / Ver: file
This docket No 1653
dated 11th Augt 1896.
C. R. 3-96

Submitting further
report in connection
with the application
of Varadachar of Tumkur

(13)

Petitioner
26/6/97

28/6/97

37

~~Report of proceedings~~

Court

~~question may be considered~~

~~advice for att.~~

~~2 It is also desirable~~

that the ~~Dy Comm.~~

~~should examine the~~

may be

petitioner ~~and~~ as to ~~his~~

& account for his state

- much that the Patta & Sanad

was in his name till

1888 - which is signed & a witness.

2 On receipt of petition ~~&~~ the above

question will be enquired into & will be advised.

By order

[illegible]

2

11-8-96

~~Ex~~ Secretary

[illegible]

11/8

Vsw 10/8/96

40

(12) 1896

From

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

L.R. 79-93-11

To The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur

Dated 17.9.96.

Despatched

Received

General No. 3041

C.Y. No. 3-93

Enclosure No. V. file

163

With reference to his ~~letter~~ No. 262 dated 7th September 1896.

I have the honor to forward herewith as requested in the above ~~for disposal and return~~ the Vernacular Records relating to the complaint of Varnachar of Tumkur regarding the resumption of his Inam land No. 76 below the Maidala Tank in the Tumkur taluk.

By order.

17/9
for Secretary

17/9

42

No 1064. Deputy Commissioner's office
Re: 1 Ver: file Tumkúr District
Dated, Tumkur, 24th June 1897.

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your Docket
No: 1655 dated 11th August 1896 calling
87 3-96
for further report in connection
with the application of Naranachár
of Tumkur, for the grant of land
in exchange for his Inam land survey No:
76 under the Maidala Tank which
was resumed by Government
owing to his resignation of the
same, I have the honor to report
that Naranachar desires that
3 acres and 17 guntas out of his
Kandayen land survey no 157
in the Settihalli village measur-
-ing 3 acres and 20 guntas and
assessed at Rupees 27-8-0 may

42

No 1064. Deputy Commissioner's office
Re: 1 Ver: file Tumkúr District
Dated, Tumkur, 24th June 1897.

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your Docket
No: 1655 dated 11th August 1896 calling
87 3-96
for further report in connection
with the application of Naranachár
of Tumkur, for the grant of land
in exchange for his Inam land survey No:
76 under the Maidala Tank which
was resumed by Government
owing to his resignation of the
same, I have the honor to report
that Naranachar desires that
3 acres and 17 guntas out of his
Kandayen land survey no 157
in the Settihalli village measur-
-ing 3 acres and 20 guntas and
assessed at Rupees 27-8-0 may

2

may be treated as shown in Exchange for Land Survey No. 6 under the Mixedlands Land, which he resigned in 1881 owing to a large portion of it having been bought under compulsory in that year.

2. Petitioner Grammar has not produced any evidence to prove his statement that the Land Survey No. 6 was in his estate after 1881. He relies on an Endorsement dated 5th January 1882 signed to him from the Land Settlement Officer directing that he was at liberty to cultivate the unreserved portion of the said Survey No. 6. This Endorsement merely means a q - 4 - 1 and was signed at Rs 83-0-0. At the first Settlement in 1881-82, only 2 - 34 acres at Rupees 20-0-0 were confirmed as Inam and the remainder 1 - 1 a. q.

14

Acreage at Regina 1-3-0 was brought under Contract. ——————— & then Petitioner was informed of this he agreed to have given up the whole of the number, being 'apparently' dissatisfied with the Grant settlement, and the whole number was accordingly brought under "Government Waste" since 1881-82. Beyond a remark to this effect in a Register kept in the Land Registry, there is no record evidencing Petitioner's relinquishment of the whole Grant Sum. 1882-83 till 1888-89, number 76 continued to be shewn in the Official Records as "Government waste".

3 In 1885-86, a portion of the said number 76, viz. 80 Acres more or less at Regina 5-3-0, was taken up for the Railway, & Compensation was paid to Petitioner for the same, as the whole number was then shewn as "Government waste" in the Records. The Petitioner

(46)

L.R. 79-93-13

Copy of letter from Collr Tanjore dtd 30-12-96 received 1-1-97 (15)

Petition, regd. 1st Jan 97, 30-12-96 from Karuvachur, com. of Tanjore-mannachar residing at Tiruchur praying for the reconsideration of the order of Govt rejecting his petition praying for the relinquishment of his Inam land & Jodi talion the Amani tank of Mydala resumed by Govt in the year 1881-82.

(2) Correspondence ending with Tanjore Dist Dy Commr's letter No 1061 of 23 June 1893 and the records received therewith

(28) Order. 6093-5 dtd 8-7-96

Survey No 76 under the Amani tank of Mydala measuring 4-9 and bearing an assessment of Rs 22 was a Brahmadeya Inam in the joint holding of Tanjavanachar (petitioner's father) and Subbanachar. In the year 1881-82, 2-34 bearing an assessment of Rs 22 out of the above extent was confirmed as Inam, the rest measuring 1-15 and bearing an assessment of Rs 11 being treated as Nirasat. For this the Inamdars received a notice served on them

In his present petition the petr moves either for the restoration of his Inam land or for the grant of other land in lieu thereof. In the order of Govt these were nothing said specifically about the Inam Inquiry. The rejection of the present may however be taken to mean that both the prayers were refused. I am therefore of opinion that the matter should now go before both the Hr Bd & Govt - I have read this note to Hr -

21-7-97

Sub & 2nd Committee

M 21/7/97 (Reported ordered - Bd's Committee's approval)

Ro - accpn 21/7/97

22.7.97

available for cultivation was thu
reduced to 3 a 2 g as assessed at Rup
28-0-0. This area was given ou
to Kambé Gowda for cultivation
in the year 1888-89.

4. The revised Khatoat accou
received in the year 1889 shows th
area of the land finally confirm
-ed as Inam to be 3 a 17 g assess
at Rupees 26-8-0, and Petitioner
is entitled to Inam to this extent.

5. The vernacular proceedings
connected with the Petitioner's case
are herewith submitted for further
reference.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant

M Narain Rao
Deputy Commissioner

Ex.

W.R.79-93-H.

57

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 5/10 · 1 · 98 [illegible]

By Order

for Secretary

Draft

Clerk

relinquished the Inam which was resumed by Govt. in the year Parthiva, 1885-86, 30 guntas of the said land bearing an assessment of Rs 5/, was taken up for railway purposes and the Inamdar was not paid compensation therefor; as the land was treated as Govt waste. In 1888 the land was granted on Darkhast to one Kamlia of Ranjangaokhurd. During the revision of the settlement held by the Survey Superintendent in pursuance of the favorable rules passed by Govt in regard to the treatment of Khalsa lands, more land (measuring 3a-9-1, assessed @ Rs 26/3) was conferred as Inam. On this, petitioner set up his claim contending that he never resigned the land, that the Govt resumed it without his consent and that he should therefore get back his land in addition to compensation for the portion taken up for the railway. Thereupon petitioner was told by the Deputy Commissioner that the Inam land which had passed into other hands could not be restored but that if he chose a suitable field

in lieu of his last Inam, a recommendation would be made in the matter. In 1934 the petitioner appealed against the above order which declined to interfere with a resumption that took place 12 years ago. In 1938 the petitioner prayed for review of the case on the grounds that the land remained in his hands till 1932 and that there was no evidence to show its resumption prior to that year. After some correspondence the A.G. Gurumurthy who was asked to select a land in consultation with the petitioner to be given to him as an equivalent of what he had lost, reports that the petitioner desires that his Kandayan land S.No. 15/1 in the Settihalli village measuring 3 a - 20 g and assessed at Rs 27-8- may be treated as Inam in lieu of his land survey No 76.

2. Under all the circumstances of the case the petition seems to be treated with generosity. He was an old Inamdar and in the final settlement a significant addition of 3 acres was made

throughout the Province this system was not called for, and at this stage the settlement of Italy was revised and Libera & and the Libraian addition was rejected by some 15 to half. and these circumstances he must not only be said ... to be forfeited to ... In the records in the Land Land Book are in his hand. There is a note in the Register that the petitions objected the Board, but the original document is missing. He contends that he did not lend a real estate and pays a part of his holding in the village of Libraian may be granted as a new one of what he rents. The site of this land namely 150 57 is one plot only is added 2 Rog - 8 the registered Comp 1 in this Stream of Re 11 - 2 - The dispersion of a yield in Libraian [illegible] as [illegible] pounds [illegible] Sparrow

(2) to a Mallow Race, the Sons are Blessed & rested & Blessed and allocate the Queen as prayed for by the petit The record of settlement Confers upon him an Enemy B 26-8- while the [illegible] assessment of 5 no 15-7 in Mallow is 327-8-11. The difference of one pence will be treated as [illegible]

(1) to Db Colin Bentham record

(2) to Mulroyght

(3) to Smith Rev Letters [illegible]

(Redacted)

Secretary

to Chief Inspector

Supt Mulroney

(2) (3) Queen Victoria Records

Settlement

Libraian